

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/779,288

Applicant(s)

HUFF ET AL.

Examiner

Cephia D. Toomer

Art Unit

1714

## All Participants:

(1) Cephia D. Toomer.

(2) Frederick S. Jerome.

Status of Application: \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 18 November 2004

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

11, 15-22 and 25

Prior art documents discussed:

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
See Continuation Sheet

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed Mr. Jerome that claim 11 lacked proper antecedent support for the cyclic benzylic diketones, that the non-elected claims should be canceled and that claim 25 did not define R. Mr. Jerome agreed that the examiner could clear up these matters by examiner's amendment..